Bethany Theological Seminary

JAN 17 1949

THE PROTESTANT

JANUARY, 1949 —a tract of the Incarnation.

Edited by Kenneth Leslie

Editorials 3

FROM AN ENGLISH RECTORY—THE INCARNATION AND ECCLESIASTICAL PRIDE

ROME ADVOCATES CORPORATIVE STATE

OUR "UNAMERICAN" BRIDGE

LUTHER MACNAIR

THE DEATH OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH II 8
By Josef Orlovsky

HIERARCHY OVER WASHINGTON 11
The Inquisition and the Loyalty Order
I. The Inquisition
By Thomas Bledsoe

BUSINESS STRATEGY IN BRITAIN 17
By Frank Jellinek

Vol. VIII No. 2 25 cents

Action will remove the doubt that theory cannot solve.
—Tehyi Hsieh

THE PROTESTANT

JANUARY, 1949

* * * * * * * * *

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
John Hammond Luther Macnair John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL SECRETARY
Katherine Kastorea

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Ruth Nanda Anshen
William T. Baird
Lee H. Ball
Russell C. Barbour
Reginald H. Bass
C. Harrison Becker
Adam Bhilippovsky
Otto Brand
Henrietta Buckmaster
R. Alex Cameron
O. Fielding Clarke
George Conner
Boise Dent
Joseph F. Fletcher
Paul J. Folino
Erwin A. Gaede
A. Eustace Haydon
Chester E. Hodgson
Daniel Hughes
Hewlett Johnson
J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Frederick D. Kershner
Stanton Lautenschlager
John A. Lee
David Lord
Donald Lothrop
John Macmurray
H. D. A. Major
John A. F. Maynard
Francis J. McConnell
Edward D. McGowan
Joseph G. Moore
J. Murdock Palmer
Dryden L. Phelps
A. Clayton Powell
Ida Pruit
Joseph A. Rabun
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
D. R. Sharpe
Watson Thomson
O. Walter Wagner
Wilfred Wakefield
Etienne Watts
Henry N. Wieman

* * * * * * * * *

THE PROTESTANT is published monthly by PROTESTANT DIGEST, Inc. Editorial and Executive Offices at 128 Manhattan Avenue, New York 25, N. Y. KENNETH LESLIE, Managing Director. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.00; 24 issues $5.00 in the United States and South America. 25¢ per copy 25¢ additional postage in Canada and foreign countries. Reentered as second class matter March 24, 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in U.S.A. Copyright, 1949, by Protestant Digest, Inc. The National Committee of Protestant Associates, under the Chairmanship of John Hammond, is a voluntary group of laymen assisting in the publication of THE PROTESTANT. Contributions for this purpose should be made to the order of THE PROTESTANT.

We welcome to our Board of Editorial Advisers: The Rev. William T. Baird, Essex Community Church, Chicago; The Rev. Reginald H. Bass, Central Community Church, Brooklyn; The Rev. O. Fielding Clarke, The Vicarage, Edenbridge, Kent, England; The Rev. Edward D. McGowan, Epworth Methodist Church, Bronx; The Rev. John Tunnicliffe, The Rectory, Saltburn-by-the-Sea, Yorkshire, England; and The Rev. Etienne Watts, Fallowfield, Manchester, England.

FROM AN ENGLISH RECTORY

And Other Editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

Dear Mr. Leslie:

I am interested to see in the June-July issue of The Protestant that the question as to whether your magazine is a religious one is raised, and that it has received replies from Ministers of sundry Churches.

This question is of prime importance because the secular authorities in your country and in ours have assumed for some long time that if a statement can be denominated "religious" it has no practical bearing on the actual means whereby men live. So long as this untruth is assumed those who at present determine the home and foreign policies both here and in the U.S.A. can rest assured that their implication in and dependence on finance-imperialism is not likely to be questioned by religious bodies.

They will, under such circumstances, pay lipservice to the value of religion, and will use it in order to sanction their secular designs.

Your magazine has forced into the foreground a doubt in the minds of our present masters as to whether religion in general and Christian religion in particular can be so relegated to the realm of fancy. If it cannot be disposed of in this way it has to be classified along with other "un-American," and soon "un-British," activities which are regarded as dangerous to the status quo.

Some of us Ministers in England are indeed in your debt for bringing about this questioning. Our debt is accentuated because you raise the issue at the time when your country is a chief protagonist in the world-decision as to whether the well-being of the few is to be put before the opportunity of life for the many.

Moreover, and this is the vital consideration, you are raising in no uncertain way the question as to whether the people's conception of GOD as being LOVE is an escapist illusion—a 'compensation' for existing inequality—or whether it is indeed a directive for human action.

You are enabling us to know that GOD IS, even in the present juncture of world affairs, LOVE; and that LOVE has been and is Incarnate. Beyong any question this means to all normal men and women that the one way to peace is to be found along the way to truth, because love can not be based on lies.

Very sincerely and gratefully yours,
(Signed) John Tunnicliffe

The foregoing letter, from a prophetic leader in the Anglican communion, the Rev. John Tunnicliffe, is perhaps the most important communication ever sent to The Protestant. Father Tunnicliffe preaches the Gospel here and subscribes to our own charter to go on preaching it. The Gospel we preach is not neo-orthodoxy. We think it is orthodox. But orthodox or heterodox it is the happy gospel of the Incarnation which means materialization: the Word made Flesh, the dream walking, living, laughing, loving, the dream of peace and brotherhood and creative joy. We believe it is one end of the bridge the other end of which is the Marxist gospel of Dialectical Materialism. That they should meet is one of the heart-purposes of our magazine.

The UnAmerican Committee, (see p.7) like an innocent child, put its finger on it when it charged us with trying to build a bridge between Christendom and Communism. Our guilt is apparent on every page of every issue. That is precisely what we strive for, pray for, a bridge.

Roman Christendom and its anti-communist Protestant satellites will have

none of this bridge. And Communism has a deep suspicion of these Western branches of Christendom. There is no more talk of the Extended Hand as in the days of the French Popular Front. Those days were hard enough. These are harder. The Soviets are pitilessly clamping down, preparing for defense. At times they seem to be taking on some of the attributes of an authoritarian orthodox church-state. They will likely continue to do so while the shepherds of the West continue to baptize the hornets' nests of aggressive radioactive war. The unblushing cynicism of these "shepherds" is without parallel in the cruel history of ecclesiastical tyranny.

But how speak of the Incarnation when each time we reach a moral low in our international dealings we seem to find further depths to explore.

Thus now our government yearns to embrace the unwholesome person of Franco, recently blessed once again by the "Viceroy of God on Earth."

Of course we have been prepared for this by our tenderness towards the industrialist creators of Nazism and by our indulgence of the whimsical murderess Ilse Koch. Surely it should not shock us to adopt the blessed Franco when we have already taken to our hearts the creators of Hitler.

So conditioned are we to cynicism that we weep drops of oil over the death of Bernadotte who died conducting a British-American manoeuver to destroy the integrity and life of the new State of Israel. The "New York Times" summing up Bernadotte's life achievements said that he had earned the respect of Himmler, said this in praise of Bernadotte, said it with a straight face. So far has our conditioning gone that we accept as praise the earning of Himmler's respect.

We gave to Chiang the instruments of his criminal attempt to abort the birth of Sun Yat Sen's New China. We, you and I, our government, are partners in that crime.

We support the butchery of the Malayans by Scottish Highlanders cried on by the child of Ramsay MacDonald.

We support the slaughter and torture of the Javanese by the Dutch.

We encourage France to use the same Nazis who ravaged the French to ravage the Indo-Chinese. We hound and harass the heroic defenders of civilization in Greece.

We flounce around with our big ships and flaunt ourselves disgracefully in the eyes of God-fearing folk everywhere.

Some reader is thinking: why criticize ourselves exclusively? He will probably write a letter asking please can we not find a few things wrong with Russia. If we could, why should we? There are things wrong with Russia and with Costa Rica too but they are not things that have to do with our world-wide aggressions. Russia is setting a terrific pace for the new democracies, pushing them frantically on the path of socialist integration. Some of them kick over the traces. Russian scientists damn each other for being bourgeois forgetting that Marx and Engels were bourgeois, Lenin too for that matter, that their whole philosophy came straight out of the bourgeois world. Yes, the Russians get off base and they get on again. Remember the corrective: "Dizzy with success"? There may be other causes for dizziness.

But remember too! Where in this wide world did Nazism find and recognize its antithesis? Was it in our freedom-loving democracies? No! It was in the USSR. A great honor no doubt but also a terrible responsibility. How terrible we only realize now as we begin to see ourselves clearly in the faces of Churchill, Truman, Dulles, Clay, Dunn, Caffery, Murphy, Spellman, Marshall, Forrestal.

For Russia faced not only the Nazis but the Nazi mind in the democracies. And now that Nazi mind dominates us, which is why we may pray that the Soviets keep wise and patient in their growing strength; but our working job is with ourselves. It is we who are trying on the mantle of empire. It is here that our responsibility lies. It is from here that the money and arms go out to feed the murder-mills of the world.

Now it is wrong to execrate the bourgeois, for while it is true that in the genealogy of profit, bourgeois capitalism begat monopoly, which begat the cartel, which begat the fascist state; nevertheless it is just as true that in another line the same bourgeois capitalism begat the proletariat, which begat political socialism, which begat the Socialist state. At any of these stages, as we are reminded by the present behaviour of the labor unions in the U.S.A. and of political socialism in England, it is possible for a retrogression to set in. However through the Bolsheviks in Russia this line did produce the Socialist state. That Socialist state sloughed off capitalism but it did not and does not war against capitalist states. It wars against the fascist state which cartel capitalism produces in order to avoid being sloughed off.

Socialism must be born out of capitalism. The birth can be easy or hard, depending on the obstetrician and on the willingness of the mother to give birth to the child. It is only when fascist rigidity settles over the frame of capitalism that surgery becomes necessary.

It is that rigidity which is settling over the bourgeois world today. It is a simple case of the rich hanging on to their money in the face of God's demand to give it up. God speaks to the rich, but their ears are stuffed with banknotes. Jesus said the last word about the rich man. Believe Jesus. They just couldn't hear him, so went to work through the poor. In China today we see the exact spirit of Jesus in Mao Tse-tung, the "poor man become commissar," to use Dr. Niebuhr's contemptuous words. We see God too in a Chinese farmer, sweat running down his face, frantically herding his oxen out of reach of our bombs, God in a child with a toy in his broken arms, crying by his dead mother, God lying dead in the dead mother, God killed by the bombs of Claire Chennault, the bombs of Truman and Marshall, the bombs of Standard Oil, the bombs of you and me, shame be upon us forever!

Here is what a Chinese Christian Communist might say: there is no neutrality in the midst of a birth. To stand around and criticize for the sake of "being fair" is to hinder the birth. The forceps may not be just the latest style in forceps. All right, if you have a better pair, hand them over. But if you haven't, then for pity's sake don't prevent us from using the only pair available. We have made and shall make all kinds of mistakes. Laugh, if you will, at our gaucheries, but it has been given to us to help a new world to be born. That you shall not stop us from doing. This, my Christian friends and one-time teachers, is the Incarnation. Laus Deo! At last, at long last, "He hath shewed strength with his arm."

Now, right away the neo-orthodox will say we identify the Realm of God with an earthly regime of power. Not so. We identify the bringing of greater justice and life to the people as sharing in the Realm of God. We are well aware that to identify God's Realm with man's realm, however advanced, is to limit God's Realm, is to freeze it, is in fact to destroy it. But it is not any particular stage of growth but the power to grow and the act of growing that are man's share in God.

No, Dr. Niebuhr, your words dismissing the poor man become commissar are too easily said. Harsh despairing words were used by Jesus of only two classes, the rich and the ecclesiastically powerful. The commissar may become proud

and overbearing, but he also may remain patient and kind. You have made a profound mistake throughout this historic period. In effect your mistake is to equate the temptations to pride of the poor and the rich. This is exactly what Jesus did not do. You never forget that all achievement may be ruined by pride but you do tend to forget that honest work may be the gate to heaven! It is at this crucial place that your religious philosophy appears to be somewhat defective. Religion for you is predominantly a revelation. It does not seem to take hold of your marrow and muscle. You are anti-mystic in your thinking and so your talk of God is unconvincing. So you seem to miss the real point of the Gospel which is the Incarnation about which Father Tunnicliffe speaks so winsomely.

For the mystic knows that, unless God has already revealed himself in a man, that particular man cannot recognize the God revealed in the Bible. Thus the Bible does not come first. Men wrote the Bible out of their hand-to-hand struggles with God. Had the Bible never been written the struggles would still be going on. In China today God is the determination of the peasants to live on earth a good life. Chiang's gang of rich men are struggling with God in the peasants. Mao too struggled with God long ago and God won. In Mao God is boss. In Chiang God is not boss.

It is false teaching to say Mao is as liable to pride as Chiang. It is false not only because that teaching becomes the excuse for supporting Chiang. It is also false in theory (and this is the nub of our contention) for as Mao incarnates the Word he becomes less liable to pride and as Chiang fights the Incarnation (within himself and outside) he becomes more liable to pride. It is for this reason that the Niebuhrians have been so often disappointed in their expectation that pride would addle the heads of the Soviet socialist administrators high and low.

Of course socialists are liable to pride and sometimes they yield to it, particularly those who wield great power; but the very nature of their task along with the weight of their responsibility are sobering factors. And what of the millions of those of lesser responsibility, teachers, loom-tenders, shepherds, fishermen, miners, building each in his place his part of his great Soviet home?

A pitiable rhapsody, you may say! But even you must admit it is at least what they think they are building. If it be a dream then it is a good dream; and, whatever it is, it stood between us and the Hitler monster and it still stands. As for us, we are ashamed of Christians who stand complacent while death is prepared for those dreamers.

Russia is today teaching mankind the meaning of the Incarnation. Many have done the same thing before, the Behards, the Anabaptists, the Levellers, but always their Incarnation ended on the Cross of ecclesiastical pride. For there, Dr. Niebuhr, is where you will find the veritable visage of pride, not merely temptation, but pride full-blown, cruel beyond conceiving.

You theologians talk much of crisis these days. There is a theology of Crisis and you have a magazine called "Christianity and Crisis." Some have seen the crisis as one of ecclesiastical division and have seen the beginning of its resolution in Amsterdam. But Amsterdam was actually but a pale reflection of the underlying realities of our world. The true crisis of modern times took place in those events and decisions which culminated and may be symbolized in the battle of Stalingrad.

For there was nothing accidental about Stalingrad. It meant the self-mastered, self-abandoned self-sacrifice of a people in the gate of humanity.

Consider what would have happened to the world—to you and me—if other decisions had been made and if the battle had been lost. The whole round globe would have been in the chains of cartel evil.

ROME ADVOCATES CORPORATIVE STATE

On November 21, 1948, the High Command of Catholic Action in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, openly advocated a corporative state for America. Every word of this monstrous manifesto was printed in the "New York Times."

The statement is a mixture of slyness and effrontery. Pretending to attack secularism these unregistered agents of a foreign government not only strike at the most precious support of our liberties, the separation of church and state, but go on to advocate American fascism. In other words these cardinal princes want to repeat in America the crucifixion of Europe.

Explicitly they ask for "organization of capital and labor in permanent agencies"..."under the supervision of government." These "basic organs" of what they call a Christian economy are to be called "Industry Councils" instead of "corporations" as in Mussolini's Italy but the idea is to try once more what these same bishops failed to accomplish with the N.R.A.; stultify our economy, perpetuate the cartels, professionalize and rationalize and forever fix in concrete a master-slave system throughout the world.

OUR "UNAMERICAN" BRIDGE

The House UnAmerican Activities Committee Report, delivered to Congress, November 22, 1948, stated that The Protestant's "avowed purpose is to 'build a bridge' between Christendom and Communism." The following answer was released to the press:

"The Protestant is under attack by the political agents of the cartels because we have broken the smooth face of the Christian Front against the Soviet. We used the phrase 'Christian-Communist two way bridge' meaning that ideas must come from both sides to make a common understanding.

"The administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference published a statement, November 21, 1948, advocating the formation, as the basic organs of our economy, 'Industry Councils' which is a new name for the 'Corporations' of Mussolini's fascism. (See above.)

"If the ministers of one church can bring its Christian influence to bear on fascism, the ministers of other churches can bring its Christian influence to bear on communism. Even the Papacy begins to pause before the fearful consequence of a new world war. Yet the alternative to a war is a bridge and the alternative to a bridge is a war. Yes, we believe Jesus of Nazareth and Francis of Assisi and Roger Williams of Providence are with us holding that bridge."

WE ARE GRATEFUL

During recent months we were humbled and gladdened to find friendship, a tough courage and a gentle wisdom in Luther Macnair who spent this past summer with us and single-handed pulled the weight of two or three skilled men. Professor Macnair had lost his position as Dean of a state teachers' college because of his espousal of the Progressive cause. He taught history brilliantly, throwing its light on the path ahead, too brilliantly it seems to suit those powerful ones who seem determined to dim all lights.

Professor Macnair spent his energies without stint, paying his own expenses and making in addition several large cash contributions. We hope he will forgive us for telling this. It is just that the editor needed to know that men like Macnair exist in this land and he thinks our subscribers need to know that such a man is among them.

THE DEATH OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH

By JOSEF ORLOVSKY

--The unsown fields of religion in New Russia.

The Revolution came and with it the simple words of the decree of January 23, 1918, which brought so much woe to the Russian Orthodox Church: ".....the Church is separated from the State and the School from the Church..." Thus Lenin knocked the props from under an institution it had taken a thousand years to build.

The decree became law. The church was no longer a department of the government. The youth of the land took up the cry of their leader shouting: "Why should we be miserable on this earth for a problematical heaven beyond? We shall create heaven right here on earth, a heaven we can enjoy while we are alive!"

They tied "icons" to the tails of their horses and dragged them along the village street singing blasphemous songs. They feasted and danced on the green, tossing their "icons" into a bonfire. Many beautiful and rare "icons," over which the art collectors are still shedding tears, went up in smoke. Their elders thought that God would smite the sacrilegious youth then and there. But nothing happened.

That was the first battle. The next started when these incorrigible youngsters began to question the sanctity of the saints.

Crowds gathered at the catacombs of the monasteries to view the opening of the shrines where the "incorruptible" bodies of the saints were "sleeping." Investigating committees were appointed. Protocol clerks were chosen. Representatives of the press, cameramen and doctors were invited. Tension was high. It was to be a showdown. It was to be the triumph of the saints and the clergy or the exposure of a hoax. High ranking clergymen were bidden to be present and in many cases were ordered to open the shrines.

The sacred candles were removed. The heavy silver tops were lifted. The shameless flashlights pierced the darkness to find...what? Dummies! Big dolls of cotton, cardboard, wads of rags, wax. The protocol clerks described minutely every little detail. The cameras clicked...the newspapermen wrote furiously....the doctors passed expert opinions. The results were publicly read and signed by the investigating committees, the doctors and hundreds of people present.

Now instead of pilgrims going to see the saints, the "saints" were taken to see the pilgrims. By train they went, by horse cart, or on the shoulders of the youths who were anxious to reintroduce the "saints" to their pilgrims. Exhibitions were arranged and the "saints" went from village to village, from town to town. These exhibitions created an indescribable fury on the part of the religious peasants against the clergy and many innocent clergymen bore the brunt of their anger.

However, the Russian soul is endowed with a great capacity for pity. The fury soon subsided and the people again felt the urge for prayer and for the spiritual succor which had brought them strength in the old epoch of the Imperial regime. Many parishes retained their priests and agreed to pay them a salary and the rent for the churches to the state, by voluntary contributions.

Nevertheless, the former upheaval left a bitter aftermath among the believers and prepared the ground for anti-religious propaganda. Anti-religious societies were organized and later consolidated under the name of the "Union of Militant Atheists." Emelyan Yaroslavsky was head of that organization and in 1923 a magazine called "Bezbozhnik" (Godless) was published. It furnished an opportunity for satirists to dip their pens in the ink of irony and ridicule God out of existence.

The following paragraph from a publication called "The Soviet Government and the Church" clearly shows the foundation of Soviet legislation pertaining to religion: "...From that point of view, all religious cults are considered by the Soviet law as ideological links with former slave epochs which are being left behind by the workers as they strive against the former ruling classes."

During the old regime a child, before he knew what life was all about, was scared to death with the horrors of hell, taught to be obedient, to sacrifice anything to save his soul, which could only be saved through the Church. To the threat of jails with police in this world was added hell with devils in the world beyond.

The leading educators in the Soviet Union believed that the religious education to which all other knowledge was subservient during the Imperial regime made a man a mental cripple. He was prevented from seeing the world as it is. His world was full of angels, devils, spooks. He was afraid to enter a dark place without a prayer; lightning and thunder made him shiver like a frightened puppy and he quickly made the Sign of the Cross to avoid being hit. He was ready for nothing and afraid of everything.

When the leaders of the Soviet Union began to rebuild the social structure, not only in European Russia, but also in the Asiatic Soviet Republics, and started an intense campaign to liquidate illiteracy, the introduction of anti-religious propaganda and anti-religious education was axiomatic. The manner in which it was to be done was expressed in the magazine "Antireligioznik," January 1, 1940.

"V. I. Lenin urgently warned the Party regarding the fallacy in the administrative supervision of religion of indulging in caustic remarks or making fun of the feelings of the religious people. He wrote that the anti-religious propaganda must be carried on in a patient, quiet way through the dissemination of knowledge."

To the people of old Russia, who were religious to the core, the "Utopia" which was being outlined and promised by their new leaders was hardly comprehensible. It was a distorted dream. Their heaven was real, a trustworthy promise, a just reward for all this suffering on earth. God surely saw that they had suffered enough through pre-war oppression, through war, through Revolution and famine. To them the road to heaven was paved with misery, fenced with thorns and watered with tears. Whoever saw a laughing saint painted on an "icon?"

There was nothing left for the new government to do but wait until belief died with the believers and to educate the new generation, guarding it from "infection."

Keeping within the boundaries of that policy, the Soviet government abolished religious holidays. Sunday was no longer a day of rest and worship. It became just another day in the week. The people who were off from their work on Sunday went to Church if they wanted to, or otherwise satisfied their religious urge.

The reader of Soviet literature soon discovered a thing which after some pondering suddenly startled him. What had happened to the Russian language? What had become of words which were so frequently used in Russia before the Revolution, such as God, prayer, holy, Mother Virgin, Jesus Christ, angels, religious, ressurection? They all had vanished from newspapers, magazines, books of fiction and radio. All these words had evaporated from the official Russian language in the Soviet Union with the exception of anti-religious publications where God was spelled with a little "g." God got no publicity of any kind.

Religion was deprived of the soil in which to sprout its roots. While schools and universities sprang up like mushrooms after the rain all over the Soviet Union and anyone who wanted a higher education could get it free; there was not a copeck for those who wanted to become teachers of religion. The Church couldn't even organize kindergartens to teach religion. Its libraries could only

keep books necessary for worship. The churches were forbidden to own any enterprise which brings profit, and thus were deprived of any hope of becoming rich. No individual could make bequests of land to the church.

And then the Germans marched into the Soviet Union to destroy Russian culture and to enslave the people. The anti-religious publications were suspended.

The faithful who had abstained from going to church to avoid the stigma of "superstition" again went to church. Everyone prayed, some inside the churches, others outside and in their own fashion. Russia was in a desperate plight.

Again the word "holy" appeared in the Russian language, over the radio, in the press, "to free holy Mother Russia from the fascist yoke..." "to free holy Russian soil from the fascist reptiles." Even unbelievers used the word without shame or reservation, because there is no other word in any language to take its place.

Candles blazed and churches filled. Priests suddenly remembered places where gold had been hidden in former days. They brought it out in defense of Mother Russia. Many of them put down their prayer books, took tommy guns and went to the front or became leaders of guerrilla detachments.

Nikolai, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich, in his article commemorating the 25th anniversary of the separation of the Church from the State wrote: "....After 25 years of the separation of the Church from the State in Russia, our eyes are turned with sincere gratitude to our government, which so wisely and to the benefit of the Church solved the problem of the relationship of Church and State."

Stalin appeared with high dignitaries of the Church. The churches were given the right to organize into dioceses and to consolidate into ecclesiastical provinces, to own printing plants and to operate theological seminaries.

"Stalin is becoming a reactionary!" many shouted with delight and were ready to embrace him tenderly. It was 1943, a time when high-ranking military men in the U.S.A. and Britain in their clubs and public bars lifted their glasses to "Thank God for the Russians!"

Did it mean that a new religious era was being born in Russia? Did the appearance of Stalin indicate the birth of a new Church? One thing sure, it meant the funeral of the old one. To the new priests he offered the harvest of unsown fields. The job of liquidating the old religion had been finished.

The marking of the graves of the young Russians tells the story. Many millions of Russians died on battlefields defending their country. No priests sprinkled their graves with holy water from a silver basin. The friends of the fallen buried him, as simple as children in their approach to infinity. With bared heads and reverence they stood over the Great Divide, and it was with tears of sorrow that they sprinkled the soil.

They prayed too. But their prayers were not the orthodox: "...May your soul rest in peace," but rather "May you live in our memory forever, and forever inspire us with your heroic deeds!"

The Russian Orthodox cross was not there. To these millions who fell in defense of a new life, that cross was the emblem of a yoke which the Russian people had shouldered for over a thousand years.

A simple mark of love to remember where the brother-in-arms had fallen, a slab of stone or an obelisk points heavenward and mutely indicates that God cannot be fathomed by mortals.

Who knows whether the tears from the bleeding hearts of loving friends or holy water from a silver basin please God the most?

At any rate it is unlikely that ever again in Russia will liturgy replace test tube or smoky candles dim the light of science.

HIERARCHY OVER WASHINGTON

By THOMAS BLEDSOE

--The Holy Inquisition and Truman's Loyalty Purge

At the beginning of the year 1948 Kenneth Leslie asked a tragic question:

"Exactly 300 years ago the modern world began with a Treaty of Tolerance (Westphalia) signed by Europe's princes. That treaty was condemned by the reigning Pope, and since then the Papacy has worked day and night to extinguish the very memory of it.

"The year 1948 is down in the calendar of the Papacy as the year in which will be opened the Great Crusade for world rule. Will the Papacy and its cartel allies succeed? Will 300 years drop out of history as Atlantis dropped into watery oblivion?"

Now before us, here in our nation, is evidence of partial justification for the fear which prompted this question. Papal bulls authorizing the Holy Inquisition and its proceedings themselves are paralleled by the President's Loyalty Order, the Mundt-Nixon Bill, and the procedure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Outstanding legal authorities, the Hon. Abraham L. Pomerantz, former counsel at Nuremberg in the trial of Nazi industrialists; and the Hon. O. John Rogge, former special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, have related the Loyalty Order, the proposed repressive legislation and the inquisitorial methods of the House Committee to similar developments in Nazi Germany. But the source of these Nazi acts was the Holy Inquisition.

The following brief account is presented as background for comparing the Nazi and proposed legislation and practices in the United States with their prototype: the Inquisition. This resume is based on the works of two great nineteenth century authorities, Lea and Llorente, and the present day apologist for the Inquisition, Walsh. ("A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages," by Henry Charles Lea, 3 vols.; "A History of the Inquisition of Spain, by Lea, 4 vols.; both reprinted by Macmillan, 1922. "Histoire Critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne," by Juan Antonio Llorente, 4 vols., Paris, 1817-1818; "The History of the Inquisition of Spain," by Llorente, abridged, Philadelphia, 1843. "Characters of the Inquisition," by William Thomas Walsh, P.J. Kennedy & Sons, 1940.)

Strong centralization of power and organization in the Roman See led to its supremacy throughout Christendom. The benefits that resulted were counterbalanced by certain evils. Among the latter were the abuse of power, the sale of ecclesiastical preferment known as simony, the sale of indulgences and of the sacraments, the favoring of relatives or nepotism, the harassing and oppressive form of taxation exacted as tithes, the sexual laxity of a clergy vowed to celibacy and chastity, and that clergy's neglect of preaching. The organized religion in which these evils flourished developed a strong tendency to fetishism and belief in the magic power of formulas and relics.

The poor and oppressed felt that this Church had failed in its mission to them. It was natural that with the stirring of the intellectual movement which was to produce the glories of the Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation, obscure, devout men working among the lowly should breed dissidence with Roman doctrines and encourage revolt against the worldliness of hierarchy and priest.

The forces of conservatism or reaction—the orthodox—and the forces of

progress—the heterodox—met inevitably for battle in this vast ferment when men were beginning to declare that the doctrines taught by the Roman Church were different from the teachings of Christ; when the possession by laymen of the Scriptures, even in Latin, was prohibited; when with the revival of the Civil Law of Justinian men found a system of jurisprudence immensely superior to canon law and barbarous feudal customs; and when the people's resistance to the exaction of ruinous tithes was branded as heresy.

Obviously then for the orthodox—the conservatives and reactionaries—to retain power and position, uniformity of belief must be enforced. Heresy, elastically defined, must be eradicated. The activities of the heterodox—the progressives—must be suppressed. The internal forum of conscience itself must be invaded and controlled. To this end, Pope Gregory IX drew up regulations which were issued in 1231 by a Roman senator in the name of the Roman people. The senator was bound to capture all designated to him as heretics and punish them after being condemned. Gregory also sent these regulations to archbishops and princes throughout Europe with orders to put them into effect. He then issued a decretal by which condemned heretics were to be abandoned to the secular arm—the civil authorities—for punishment which was burning alive at the stake. Also, everyone knowing of heresy was bound under pain of excommunication to denounce it to the ecclesiastical authorities.

The Inquisition may be considered to have been founded when Gregory issued two bulls, April 20, 1233, making the persecution of heresy the special function of the Dominicans. Trained experts were needed to discover offenders and extort confessions of guilt. In committing the Inquisition to the Mendicant Orders—the Dominicans and also the Franciscans—it was considered that unnecessary cruelty or persecution dictated by private interests and personal revenge would be avoided. The popularity of the Mendicant Orders would assure them assistance in this work that could not be counted upon by bishops who were usually in conflict with their flocks and the secular lords. But Gregory's tone in invading the jurisdiction of the bishops is apologetic.

Slowly, tentatively the Inquisition grew as an expedient to meet a special emergency. Heresy, however, persisted. The new institution, being accepted and proving useful in ways other than preserving purity of the faith, became permanent.

A carefully considered and elaborate law to establish machinery for systematic persecution as an integral part of the social edifice in every city and state was issued by Innocent IV. This was his famous bull, "Ad Extirpanda," May 15, 1252, sent to all the potentates and rulers of Italy. They were ordered to ban heretics publicly. Each chief magistrate was to appoint twelve good Catholics with notaries and servitors whose sole business was to arrest heretics, deliver them to the bishop and seize their goods. Wages and expenses were to be paid by the State. Evidence of these officers was receivable without oaths. No statutes were to be passed interfering with their actions. The ruler was bound to send his officers to aid them. Every inhabitant was obliged, under heavy penalties, to assist them.

The ruler was ordered to torture those who would not confess or betray other heretics. He was required to have four lists made of all accused of heresy. One was to be read in public three times a year. Copies were to be given to the bishop, to the Dominicans and Franciscans. After sentence, the ruler was to punish the condemned.

Fines, commutations, and confiscated property were to be divided into three parts. One third went to the city, one third to those arresting the heretics, and one

third to the bishop and inquisitors.

To enforce all this, the papal bull was to be written inerasably into all local law books. So were any more decrees the popes might issue. Rulers and their officials must swear to enforce these laws. Neglect to do so was punishable as perjury with perpetual infamy, a heavy fine, and suspicion of heresy involving loss of office and disability for all official position in the future.

This papal legislation was shrewdly and carefully devised to accomplish a settled policy. It also provided the Inquisition in Italy with a completely organized personnel paid and sustained by the State. It armed the Inquisition with all the means necessary for the thorough performance of its work. First in Italy, then in France and Spain, the whole force of the State was unreservedly at the command of the Inquisition.

Within a few years the right to annul all laws that obstructed the freest exercise of the Inquisition's powers in Italy was claimed by Alexander IV for his inquisitors and bishops. The right was made universally applicable in 1265 by Urban IV. It was carried into canon law and became an accepted maxim of law. Inquisitors, exercising almost limitless authority, were practically relieved from supervision and responsibility. Thus did the Inquisition become in effect supreme.

The organization of the Inquisition was simple. It did not seek to impress with magnificence, but to paralyze the minds of men and women with terror. A few days before visiting a city, the inquisitor would notify the proper authorities requiring them to call the people together. On arriving, the inquisitor would summon them to come forward within a specified period of days and reveal to him anything they knew or had heard about anyone leading to the belief or suspicion that he might be a heretic, or that he had spoken against any article of faith, or whether he differed in life or morals from the common community.

The inquisitor also proclaimed a "time of grace" during which any heretic coming forward of his own will and confessing his guilt, abjuring, and giving full information about fellow heretics was promised mercy. One of the great Inquisitors, Bernard Gui, assures us in his "Practica," an authoritative work on the Inquisition, that this device was exceedingly effective. Many conversions resulted and a tremendous amount of information was obtained about heretics who otherwise would not have been suspected.

It is easy to imagine the terror into which a community would be thrown when an inquisitor suddenly descended upon it and issued his proclamation. No one knew what stories might be circulating about him, or whether they would be carried to the inquisitor by some fanatic or personal enemy. Confidence between man and man would disappear. For one heretically inclined the suspense grew daily. Some careless word of his might be revealed to the inquisitor even by those nearest and dearest. The suspense grown unbearable, he would go to the inquisitor and betray others rather than himself be betrayed. Thus Bernard Gui writes that the invisible net extended far and wide. Among the benefits resulting to the Inquisition were, Gui informs us, the extensive confiscations of property which followed.

Confessions were carefully recorded in books kept for the purpose. Inquisitors were instructed to preserve records of all their proceedings from the first summons to the final sentence. An official who wanted information about anyone even in the smallest village could readily find out about him from the Inquisition's indexes if he had ever been suspected.

So effectively organized was the Inquisition that there was no safe refuge for heretics in any land where it existed. A suspicious stranger would be arrested.

His birthplace would be discovered. Swift messengers would soon have full official documents about him from the Inquisition at his former home.

Among the functionaries of the Inquisition, those known as familiars—that is, petty officers, messengers, spies, bravos—must be mentioned. The obvious dangers of such work held little attraction for the honest and peaceable, but were no obstacle to the reckless and evil minded. Anyone molesting these servants of the Inquisition was charged with impeding its operations and suspected of heresy. Anyone resisting their aggressions was liable to prosecution. These familiars could, therefore, tyrannize defenseless populations and extort money from them by threatening arrest or accusation before the Inquisition.

The process developed by the Inquisition must be briefly considered. The inquisitor was both judge and father-confessor to the accused. His task was to ascertain the secret thoughts and opinions of the prisoner. The crime he sought to suppress was a mental one.

It is no wonder then that the inquisitors—bent on upholding the faith and virtually assuming in advance the guilt of the accused—freed themselves from the shackles of recognized trial procedure prevailing both in episcopal and secular courts. So it was that of the three forms of criminal actions—accusation, denunciation and inquisition—that of inquisition became the invariable rule.

Inquisitors were instructed to proceed summarily, to permit no obstructions arising from judicial rules or from advocates, to shorten the proceedings by depriving the accused of facilities for defense. Thus the safeguards necessary to prevent injustice and to subject the judge to responsibility were deliberately cast aside--even though the reputation, property and life of the accused were involved, and the sentence would directly affect his sons and grandsons.

In many cases the inquisitor could have no assurance that there had been a crime. The accused might at some time have been seen talking with others who later were proved to be heretics. He might have given them some assistance or even attended one of their meetings. Yet notwithstanding all this he could be thoroughly orthodox. However his own assertion of orthodoxy went for nothing. Experience had proved that most heretics, schooled by persecution to conceal their beliefs, would subscribe to anything. Confession of heresy became, therefore, of utmost importance. It was the aim of the inquisitorial process.

To extort a confession the inquisitor had two methods at his disposal. First, he employed crafty questions and elaborate artifices. When these failed, he resorted to force: long and harsh imprisonment, gradual starvation, and the slow torture of delays.

The door to the use of outright torture was opened by Innocent IV in his bull "Ad Extirpanda," demanding that heretics be treated as ordinary criminals. Secular authorities were, however, to apply the torture. Canon law prohibited ecclesiastics from using it to force confessions or from even being present, under penalty of irregularity, in the torture chamber. But this made for delays which did not suit the inquisitors. Alexander IV authorized inquisitors and their associates to grant one another dispensations for irregularities—a permission which led to the use of torture under direct supervision of the inquisitors. Urban IV confirmed this permission. Even an apologist for the Inquisition such as Walsh admits that this was "plainly a consent to evade the canon law."

Torture was a quick and effective method of obtaining information and confessions. Its use by the Inquisition grew rapidly although its extension into secular jurisprudence was slow. When the prisoner refused to answer as desired or to con-

fess, he was first shown the instruments of torture. If he still refused, he was put to the torture.

Making an effort at reform Clement V decreed that a prisoner might be tortured only once. "Overzealous Inquisitors," however, as Walsh states, "found a way to get around this, by describing a second torment as a 'continuation,' not a repetition." A further excuse for applying more torture was to allege that new evidence had been discovered. Inquisitors also claimed that the pope had not spoken of witnesses. They could, therefore, be tortured at the discretion of inquisitors. Rules for the use of torture adopted by the Inquisition eventually became those of the secular courts in general.

An early effort had been made to lay down rules as to what constituted evidence of heresy. But the Council of Narbonne in 1244 ruled that it was sufficient if the accused could be shown to have manifested by any word or sign that he had faith or belief in heretics or considered them to be "good men."

In testimony great weight was attached to popular report. Witnesses against the accused were encouraged to say anything that might occur to them. Their opinions whether based on knowledge or prejudice, hearsay evidence, vague rumors, or idle gossip were freely received.

Recognizing the vicious circle in which he moved, a conscientious inquisitor might satisfy himself that certain infallible signs existed to justify the conclusion of heresy. Among these were the confession of sins to confessors not regularly ordained; praying with them according to their rites; being present with them when they blessed bread; receiving "peace" from them. Pallor might indicate heresy, signifying the ascetic life of certain heretical sects. Visiting heretics, giving them alms, guiding them on journeys were often sufficient for condemnation.

Husband or wife knowing the other to be a heretic and not giving information within a year was held to be a consenting party and punishable as a heretic. A son was qualified as "suspect" of heresy by continuing to visit his needy mother and aiding her after she had become heretical—although there was absolutely nothing else against him. Only by delivering her to the Inquisition could he have cleared himself.

To prevent the acquittal of those who could not be forced to confess, it was necessary to invent a new crime—suspicion of heresy. The door was opened to punishing those who were merely suspected of guilt. From the Inquisition this practice found its way into secular law. Later we shall see here in our own country the same practice at work—punishment of those merely suspected of guilt.

Civil Roman law rejected the evidence of accomplices, and the Church had followed this rule. But when it came to prosecuting heresy all prohibitions were discarded. The evidence of other excommunicates, perjurers, infamous persons, usurers, harlots—all who in the ordinary criminal jurisprudence of the time were regarded as incapable of bearing witness—was receivable against the heretics.

To this crime against justice, another was added. The names of witnesses were withheld from the accused. The reason given was the danger to which witnesses would be exposed. That there was some risk to those who malignantly destroyed their neighbors is shown by reports of assassinations. Yet withholding the names of witnesses on the pretense of protecting them was no more than a flimsy excuse by the Church to cover its outright denial of justice. No such precaution was taken in other criminal proceedings, even those involving capital punishment.

From this crime against the accused it was but a step to another, that of withholding the evidence against him. This too was done. The inevitable resulted.

The business of the Inquisition was greatly increased by the protection given informers and enemies. It became an instrument of false-witness.

A man or woman accused by the Inquisition as a sympathizer with, or protector of, heretics; or accused of suspicion of heresy or as a heretic, found himself, if pronounced guilty, facing a whole series of punishments ranging from ruinous fines, harsh penances, imprisonment for years or life, confiscation of property, and death. Even if penitent, he might be reprieved but never pardoned. If excommunicated for heresy, his house was pulled down, all other property was confiscated, his sons and grandsons were declared ineligible for public office, thus completing their ruin as heirs. The condemned himself was handed over to the secular arm to be burned at the stake.

The case against the accused was made up secretly before his arrest. He was examined in secrecy, urged to confess, perhaps imprisoned for years and tortured before he was allowed to know what the charges were against him. Not until after a confession had been extorted or the inquisitor despaired of extorting one, was the accused informed of the evidence against him, but the names of witnesses even then were withheld.

Throughout, the accused was denied counsel—thus rendering him all but helpless in his defense before a judge who was also the prosecutor. One method of escape was open to him—that of barring the evidence of witnesses by proving their mortal enmity. But their names were withheld, so he was forced to grope about blindly in an effort to identify witnesses whom he could claim were mortal enemies. If he chanced to hit upon any, the inquisitor decided as he saw fit whether to retain or reject their testimony. By a legal fiction, the inquisitor was supposed to be impartial, taking care of the defense as well as of the prosecution. If the accused failed to guess the names of mortal enemies among the witnesses and so disable their testimony, he was condemned.

If the accused refused to plead, his obstinacy only simplified matters. His refusal was an act of contumacy—stubborn resistance to authority—equivalent to a confession of guilt. He was handed over to the secular arm fit only for the stake.

A prisoner against whom there was no evidence and who would not confess was kept in prison as long as ordered by the inquisitor. Eventually, if the proof against him was only incidental and not direct he would be discharged under bail on the chance of further testimony turning up against him. When on occasion the accusation failed entirely the charges were simply declared not to be substantiated. So that there would be no bar to later proceedings in case of fresh evidence inquisitors were warned never to pronounce the accused innocent.

The Inquisition was established at a time when a whole new way of life was coming into being. Those determined to abort it, to root out the new life with an "obstetrical hand," developed the inquisitorial process and all its horrors just described. To their crimes against humanity was added the gradual demoralization of secular jurisprudence. For five hundred years the inquisitorial process became the customary method of dealing with all accused in the civil courts of most of Europe. The accused were treated as having no rights, their guilt was assumed in advance, the established purpose was to extort confession.

When the crime of suspicion was imported from the Inquisition into secular practice the accused could be punished merely for being suspected of crime. The penalty was not specified in the law but was imposed at the judge's discretion. Such perversion of justice continued until the democratic reforms in the eighteenth century inspired by the Protestant Reformation and the Enlightenment. (Cont. in Feb.)

BUSINESS STRATEGY IN BRITAIN

By FRANK JELLINEK

To Englishmen the initials FBI do not mean a political police but the real power behind the whole state apparatus—the Federation of British Industries.

After the 1945 elections, in which the working people of England made a genuine attempt to gain control of their government, the FBI, by a mixture of bullying, flattery and straight sabotage, regained most of the position it had held since its formation in 1917, the year in which British labor began ten years of real militant action.

The FBI employs a majority of all the workers in a "Socialist" England whose aim, as declared by Herbert Morrison, is "80% private enterprise, 20% nationalisation." At the end of 1947, the FBI included around 5,000 individual firms and 270 Trade Associations. It probably employed about 9,000,000 workers and represented a capital of $50,000,000,000. If the FBI were merely opposed to the Labor Government it would be formidable. But the FBI is in fact part of the "Socialist" Government and is that much more deadly.

The FBI Report for 1947 disclosed that it has representatives on 36 governmental agencies at national and regional level, including the supreme National Planning Board. It is also represented on 21 other industrial, scientific, legal, commercial and educational bodies close to the government. That is why Minister of Labor George Isaacs insisted at the ILO conference last year on the "right" of employers to organize. He wanted international sanction for a fact long-accomplished in England.

The Federation has never been modest in its claims. In 1936 it described itself, correctly, as "the largest association of manufacturers in the world, accepted by Government, Press and public as the authoritative voice of British Industry." Recently, the FBI has extended its range from industry to include banking and insurance and has virtually fused with the British Employers Confederation. The smaller National Association of Manufacturers and the Association of British Chambers of Commerce (a relatively unimportant body compared to its U. S. counterpart) have long worked very closely with the FBI.

Like similar organizations in other countries, the FBI, owing to its internal structure and voting system (mainly by number of workers employed) is tightly controlled by a small group of very powerful concerns and cartels, which have powers to intervene at every level, especially in the subcommittees. This group makes policy to such an extent that the Labor Government has on several occasions, notably on the vital trade agreement with the USSR, postponed its decisions until the FBI got around to discussing them inside its own organization.

Consultations between Sir Stafford Cripps and the FBI leaders have been relatively open, publicized as attempts "to obtain voluntary agreement" on such things as limiting profits and dividends. But the FBI Reports themselves claim successes by "representations" to the Government, by private interviews and consultation with Cabinet Ministers—which is of course the way things are really done.

Politically, the FBI's overwhelming economic influence is expressed only partly through the Conservative Party. Even more importantly it can be traced in the top circles of the Labor Party which have been pressured into admitting the FBI into the administrative side of the nationalized industries.

Here labor has come up against three main difficulties. It finds a considerable amount of hidden sabotage from the managerial elements left over from priv-

ate industry, a considerable amount of nepotism by the older trade union bosses, resulting in overstaffing and waste, and a growing demand by the workers on the job for some kind of worker control since they find very little difference between the new national managers and the old private bosses (the two very often have family or business connections).

The new drive of the FBI from within the Labor Government set-up coupled with the collapse of mass purchasing power has brought a new political situation which may soon come to a head. The demand for coalition between Labor and Conservatives is no longer coming from the Conservatives, as it did last year, but from influential circles close to the Fabian Brains Trust, from which the Government's "experts" are recruited. They are increasingly convinced that the Marshall Plan, so far as Britain is concerned, is a deliberate fraud and actually designed to smash the sterling area without granting any compensation in the form of junior partnerships in imperial exploitation. FBI politicians were enraged by Truman's switch over Palestine because it appeared directly aimed at the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company's major partnership in Middle Eastern oil.

The policy is now to let people like Bevin and Morrison, both of them physically sick men, simply die out. Bevin has survived disasters which would normally have broken half a dozen Foreign Secretaries merely because foreign policy is no longer directed through Parliament, while the working class, faced with imminent economic crisis, has shown absolutely no trace of interest in Marshall Aid, Palestine, Greece or any other foreign policy issue. The workers are against Bevin in the same way that Bevin is against Franco. Most of the unions have even flatly refused to purge domestic Communists except where the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists has put pressure on.

Of more restricted major issues everything still turns on steel nationalisation, although this is not mentioned in polite circles. As G. D. H. Cole, an important Government adviser, wrote; "the battle over the issue of nationalising the steel industry was joined the very moment the Labor Government took office in 1945. It was widely felt in capitalist circles that none of its other socialisation measures would really matter or would involve any real advance towards Socialism if it could only be stopped from nationalising steel. Ever since 1945 this battle has been going on behind the scenes."

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the present Cabinet would much rather not socialise steel, whose biggest interests are at the top of the FBI. At present, leading Labor politicians would like to make it the main issue at the elections of 1950, feeling that they can frighten the steel magnates into relatively good production by holding the threat over their heads. But FBI strategy is also fighting for postponement of the steel issue, not so much because it expects the Conservatives to win as because it believes that it can by then force the Labor Party leadership into open opposition to the working class rank and file.

The employers' strategy is at present to make some show of limiting dividends in order to freeze wages. With a form of Cagoulard mentality, many employers are now trying to drop production in order to create the reservoir of unemployment they have always openly advocated. The tactic has already had some success. Overall unemployment has not greatly increased but some trades have been hit.

Failing to get anywhere through the boss-ridden trade union structure, the men on the job are resorting to direct action, electing their own strike committees, as in the London docks strike. Such strikes have deep political implications but most of the strike committee leaders are not interested in anything except safe-

guarding working conditions which they see as even more threatened by the Government than by the former bosses. The Communist issue has of course been raised by the union bosses, by Cabinet ministers, by the press and the BBC, but not seriously on the docks themselves. It is true that the Communist Party did foretell the sharpening of the economic crisis, saw that the workers would spontaneously take action to bring wages up to increasing prices and decided to support these moves.

Naturally they saw also the political implication in the fact that the movement for wage rises was linked to Marshall Aid, in that the employers and Government would use American supplies to assist their drive to keep down wages and increase unemployment, whether on American instructions or not. But they did not advocate fomenting strikes in an attempt to smash the Marshall Plan.

The strikes so far and the threats—miners, dockers, engineers, post office workers—have come from unions where the Communists do not have organizational control. The Communist Party itself was rather notably reticent about supporting the initial stages of the strike. The only organized bodies trying to take an active part in the strike were the so-called Revolutionary Communist Party (Fourth International) and the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists.

The role—or rather lack of role—of the Communists is important because there is a prospect that England may soon become the scene of mass economic strikes, as France was last year. The hidden crisis has suddenly become obvious. Indicative are the shops full of women's clothing at bargain prices and reduced ration coupons, stores practically begging customers to buy.

The reason is simply that savings are exhausted and that earnings are behind even the reduced prices. Since the FBI has penetrated the Government there is little likelihood that prices will be further controlled. Thus the Labor Government, by its own predicament, will be forced to move against those who elected it in 1945. The more it does so the less possibility there is of real socialism.

* * * * *

WOULD MAN BUT WAKE

Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise.
Age after age their tragic Empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep:
Would Man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise.

Earth shall be fair, and all her people one:
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.
Now, even now, once more from earth to sky,
Peels forth in joy man's old undaunted cry,—
'Earth shall be fair, and all her folk be one!'

Clifford Bax

THE CAGE

It is the buried old that spawns the new,
It is finality that spreads the feast
And sets cold teeth behind warm lips to chew
The killed thing, be it fruit or bird or beast.

Habit is death to impulse and a song
Is shamed whose singing grows habitual.
Yet men must eat and men must carry along
Their heritage in custom and in ritual.

And this machine, this habit chilled to steel,
This stealthy anaesthesia of the hand,
This row of rigid numbers that can feel
No shade of yielding in their stark command,
Yes, even with this our will may weave a cage
Wherein protected we may sing our rage!

K. L.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

THE 200

We promised we would publish, and here we are! We sent a postcard appeal to over 10,000 of our subscribers. 200 answered and this magazine literally is theirs. We are deeply grateful to them for the real sacrifices they have made and especially for their letters every one of which warmed the heart and strengthened the courage of the editor. May we perhaps hear from another 200? We realize that large sums are not available. We have arranged our affairs so that $5 will do the work of $50. That is our share of the sacrifice and it has been a great joy. Many have been unable to help just at the moment. We are hopeful that they will keep us in mind in the future, the near future, if possible.